

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 2-5, 34-40, 42 and 43 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 33 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

### Request for Telephone Interview

Applicants hereby respectfully request a telephone interview with the Examiner to discuss the present application, prior to the Examiner's acting on this amendment. The Examiner is requested to call Applicants' representative (the undersigned) by telephone at (408) 720-8300 to schedule such interview.

### Response to Rejections

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 6-15, 17-33 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on U.S. Patent no. 6,434,599 of Porter ("Porter"). Claims 16, 37 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Porter.

Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that the present invention, as claimed, is patentable over the cited art. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. (Currently amended) A computer-implemented apparatus for use by a plurality of users using a plurality of user devices, the apparatus comprising a plurality of agents of a plurality of different types to communicate with each other, at least some of the agents representing physical entities, the plurality of agents including:
  - a plurality of device agents, each representing one of the plurality of user devices; and
  - a plurality of persona agents, **which are separate entities from the device agents**, each of the persona agents representing one of the plurality of users;

**wherein the plurality of persona agents collect information about properties of other agents, including the device agents, and route the collected information to one or more other agents, of the plurality of agents, which subscribe to the properties. (Emphasis added.)**

Independent claim 33 includes similar limitations.

Note that the amendment to claims 1 and 33 was not necessitated by the prior art nor made in response to the rejection, since Porter failed to disclose at least one limitation in claims 1 and 33 prior to the amendment (as explained below and previously). Nonetheless, Applicants believe that the amendment places the claims in better form.

Porter relates to a system for providing on-line chat. Assuming *arguendo* Porter discloses any type of “agent”, Porter fails to disclose or suggest device agents which represent user devices, and persona agents which represent users and which are separate entities from the device agents. Porter also fails to disclose or suggest any agents which collect information about properties of other agents, or agents which subscribe to such properties.

First, it appears that the Examiner considers an information site in Porter to read on the various types of agents recited in Applicants’ claims (Final Office Action, pp. 9-10). However, assuming *arguendo* an information site in Porter is or includes an agent, Porter still does not disclose or suggest a plurality of persona agents which are separate entities from the plurality of device agents. For at least this reason, claims 1 and 33 are not anticipated by Porter.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

In addition, the Examiner contends that Porter discloses “the plurality of persona agents collect information about properties of other agents, including the device agents, and route the collected information to one or more other agents, of the plurality of agents, which subscribe to the properties” at col. 4, line 51 – col. 5 line 21 and col. 6 line 63 – col. 8, line 45 (Final Office Action, p. 3). However, that is incorrect. Assuming *arguendo* an information site in Porter is or includes a persona agent as recited in claims 1 and 33, those information sites do not collect information about other information sites, much less “information about properties of other agents” as recited in claims 1 and 33 (emphasis added). An information site 100 in Porter simply gathers information from users (col. 4, lines 58-60), not information from other information sites, and not information about properties of other information sites.

Porter does disclose a third party chat server 1020 that can collect information from information sites (Figure 10). However, assuming *arguendo* the chat server 1020 is considered to be or include a persona agent as recited in claims 1 and 33, it does not collect information about information sites or “information about properties of” the information sites per claims 1 and 33 (emphasis added). Also, Porter does not disclose a plurality of such chat servers (and, therefore, no “plurality of persona agents”).

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 33 are not anticipated by Porter. Furthermore, because Porter provides no motivation or suggestion as to why it would be desirable to provide the above-mentioned claim features and functionality, the present invention also could not be obvious based on Porter.

### Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

### Conclusion


For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 5, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jordan M. Becker  
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 26529  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300